



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/749,135

12/30/2003

Ajay G. Gupta

INTEL27

3845

48510

7590

11/15/2007

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP/ INTEL CORPORATION

600 PEACHTREE ST

SUITE 5200

ATLANTA, GA 30308-2216

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/15/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/749,135

Applicant(s)

GUPTA ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snead et al (US 2003/0041179 A1) in view of (Warwick US 6598169 B1) and further in view of Lucovsky (US 6,868,450 B1).

As to claim 1, Snead teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a driver (driver 206, para [0033], ln 12-14/ Fig. 2), interface device (storage device 204, para [0033], ln 12-14), access data (erasing the content on the media, para [0037], ln 13-15/access to remove a tape of tape drives, para [0042], ln 4-6/ erasing media and adding ... for the tape or device, para [0043], ln 5-8), driver adapted to control interface device and monitor access data (para [0037], ln 6-15); a second manager adapter(the application, para[0038], ln 6-14/ para[0039], ln 19-22/ client applications 202, para[0034], ln 1-5), a first connection manager adapted to register with the driver and receive notification data from the driver, the driver provides the notification data to the first connection manager(para[0038], ln 6-14/ para[0039], ln 19-22), the first connection

Art Unit: 2194

manager(the library manager 200, para[0035], ln 1-4/ the library manager 200 is an application that enables multiple client applications 202 to share one or more removable storage devices 204, ,para[0033], ln 3-6/ therefore the library manager is a connection manager), when the driver detects network access data from a second connection manager(para[0037], ln 1-15), the access data corresponding to connection attempts made to the driver(para[0043], ln 1-7), the notification data corresponding to the connection attempts(para[0044], ln 1-12).

Snearad does not explicitly teach register with the driver. However, Warwick teaches register with the driver (If the mapping driver 230 has registered with the ACPI driver 233 to receive the event, the ACPI driver 233 passes the notification to the mapping driver 230, col 6, ln 15, 20).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Snearad with Warwick to incorporate the feature of register with the driver because this provides features of compliant hardware which can be exposed to user mode applications without the need to develop private kernel mode drivers for each of several user mode applications.

Snearad does not explicitly teach network access a network interface card. However, Lucovsky teaches network access a network interface card (communication packets through a network transport control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP) driver to a network interface card, col 2, ln 20-25/ determine whether the software can access the network interface card, col 2, ln 33-35).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Snearad to incorporate the feature of network access a

Art Unit: 2194

network interface card because this provides the system to restrict access of one computer to one or a set of network interface card.

As to claim 8, Lucovsky teaches network access data comprises network driver interface specification (NDIS) object identifiers (col 5, ln 7-9).

As to claim 9, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Lucovsky teaches monitoring network access data from a second connection manager (col 11, ln 29-33), so that the connection manager can monitor connection attempts made to the driver for access interface (para [0006], ln 4-7/ para [0033], ln 3-6/ para [0034], ln 1-18/ para [0037], ln 15-18).

As to claims 10, 17-18, they are apparatus claims 8, 9; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8, 9 above.

3. Claims 2, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snead et al (US 2003/0041179 A1) in view of (Warwick US 6598169 B1) in view of Lucovsky (US 6,868,450 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nakamura et al (US 2003/0078898 A1).

As to claim 2, Snead, Warwick and Lucovsky do not explicitly teach a user interface adapted to receive notification data the first connection manager, receive user input from a user, and provide the user input to the first connection manager. However, Nakamura teaches a user interface adapted to receive notification data from the first connection manager, receive user input from a user, and provide the user input to the first connection manager (the user' home 26

Art Unit: 2194

are connected with unit charge notification apparatus 33 in the service facilities 21, para [0092], In 1-5/ Fig. 4/ the apparatus 33 notifies the received initial unit charge to the charging apparatus 34 and the user's home 26, para [0107], In 3-6para[0053], In 3-6/ the user can look at the displayed unit charge on the display 28 , then can access to the computer 24 in the service facilities 21 , para[0108], In 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sneard, Warwick and Lucovsky to incorporate the features of a user interface adapted to receive notification data the first connection manager, receive user input from a user, and provide the user input to the first connection manager because this allows a users to use the service in user's desired manner by looking at the display unit.

As to claim 3, Nakanura teaches display the notification data received from the first connection manager to the user (para [0101], In 1-3).

4. Claims **4-7, 11-16, 19-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snead et al (US 2003/0041179 A1) in view of (Warwick US 6598169 B1) in view of Lucovsky (US 6,868450 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jenney (US 6,349,335 B1).

As to claim 4, Snead, Warwick and Lucovsky do not teach the first connection manager is adapted to unregistered with the driver and the driver is further adapted to stop monitoring access data. However, Dominic teaches the first connection manager is adapted to unregistered with the driver and the driver is further adapted to stop monitoring access data (IF the user indicated that they wish to withdraw the computer 20 from the list of those computer being

Art Unit: 2194

monitored by the server 16, clicking on field 62 with pointer 64 will remove the computer from the list of identified computers eligible for being monitored by the server, col 8, ln 39-45).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sneard, Warwick and Lucovsky to incorporate the features of the first connection manager is adapted to unregistered with the driver and the driver is further adapted to stop monitoring access data because this detects a computer failure or crash during operation when the user is not attending the computer so that such a failure may be addressed as soon as possible.

As to claim 5, Jenney teaches the first connection manager is adapted to unregistered with the driver and the driver is further adapted to stop monitoring network access data when instructed to do so by a user via a user interface (col 8, ln 40-50/ ln 32-37).

As to claim 6, Jenney teaches the first connection manager is adapted to unregistered with the driver and the driver is further adapted to stop monitoring network access data when required by a predetermined policy rule (col 9, ln 61-67).

As to claim 7, Jenney teaches the first connection manager is further adapted to disable the second connection manager (col 8, ln 41-46).

As to claims 11-12, they are apparatus claims of claims 4, 7; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4, 7 above.

As to claims 13, 14, they are apparatus claims of claims 4-5; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-5 above.

Art Unit: 2194

As to claim 15, it is an apparatus claim of claims 3-4; therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 3-4 above. In additional, Jenney teaches determining if user input requires disabling the first connection manager (col 9, ln 65-67).

As to claim 16, Jenney teaches if the second connection manager is registered with the driver then unregistering the second connection manager with the driver associated with the device (col 8, ln 39-47), wherein the unregistering of the second connection manager is prior to registering the first connection manager with the driver associated with the device (col 7, ln 59-61).

As to claims 19-24, they are apparatus claims of claims 11-16; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 11-16.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

November 13, 2007


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER